

## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In this application, claims 27-36 are currently pending. Claims 1-26 have been cancelled. In the present response, claims 27 and 32 are amended. Claims 28-31 and 33-36 are unchanged.

Claims 27-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20050280502) in view of Pechatnikov et al (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20040027258).

Applicant expresses appreciation to Examiner Khai Nguyen and SPE Rafael Perez-Gutierrez for the courtesy of an interview, which was granted to Applicant's representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held in the USPTO on November 27, 2007. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary.

At the interview, claims 27 and 32 were discussed vis-à-vis the prior art of Bell, Pechatnikov, and Sheha et al (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20030016804). The Interview Summary states, in relevant part, "The Examiner and Mr. Colb discussed proposed amendments to the above mentioned claims in view of the teachings of Pechatnikov, et al. These proposed amendments appear to overcome the teachings of Pechatnikov, et al., however, the Examiner brought the Sheha et al. reference to Applicant's attention as being relevant to the proposed amendments. The Applicant will consider the Sheha et al. reference when responding to the last Office Action."

Bell describes a system and method for obtaining information relating to a person without face-to-face, verbal or other contact. Pechatnikov describes a method for displaying a map including storing map data on a server including a plurality of layers and a set of templates. Sheha describes a system and method for providing real-time position information of one party to another party by utilizing a conventional

telecommunication network system such as the convention telephone network, a mobile telecommunications network, a computer network, or the Internet.

As discussed at the interview, Applicant has considered the Sheha reference in addition to the other cited prior art and accordingly amended claim 27 to include the recitation “said server also being operative to provide to said second user via said second user’s mobile communicator, personal information relating to said first user upon receipt of authorization from said first user, using said first user’s mobile communicator, said server additionally being operative, following: provision to said first user of said personal information relating to said second user; and provision to said second user of said personal information relating to said first user, to enable communication between said first and second user via said first user’s mobile communicator and said second user’s mobile communicator.”

Applicant submits that none of the cited prior art, alone or in combination, shows or suggests an introductions system including, *inter alia*, a server communicating with a plurality of mobile communicators where the server is operative to employ a mobile communicator location functionality for providing a visually sensible map indicating the relative locations of a plurality of the mobile communicators in communication with the server in a space, the server also being operative to provide to a second user via the second user’s mobile communicator, personal information relating to a first user upon receipt of authorization from the first user, using the first user’s mobile communicator, where the server is also operative, following provision to the first user of the personal information relating to the second user and provision to the second user of the personal information relating to the first user, to enable communication between the first and the second user via the first user’s mobile communicator and the second user’s mobile communicator, as recited in amended claim 27 and that claim 27 is therefore patentable.

Similar amendments have been made to method claim 32 and claim 32 is therefore patentable. Support for the amendments to claims 27 and 32 can be found in Figs. 9 and 10 of the application and paragraphs [0097] and [0107] of the specification as filed.

Claims 28-31 each depend from claim 27 and recite additional patentable subject matter and are therefore patentable. Claims 33-36 each depend from claim 32 and recite additional patentable subject matter and are therefore patentable.

Applicant has carefully studied the remaining prior art of record herein and concludes that the invention as described and claimed in the present application is neither shown in nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CLIFFORD J. MASS  
LADAS & PARRY LLP  
26 WEST 61ST STREET  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023  
REG. NO.30,086(212)708-1890